

02-277

From: Wight, Callie MA, RN, C
To: Michael Copps
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 6:15 PM
Subject: UNE-P

DO NOT ELIMINATE THE UNE-P! DO NOT DEREGULATE PHONE SYSTEMS!
THIS IS A MOVE WHICH WILL ONLY HARM THE CONSUMER. WE ARE ALL ALREADY
WEIGHED DOWN BY THE HIGH COST OF UTILITIES AND GASOLINE.
WE CANNOT FOOT MORE BILLS FOR BUSINESS.
STOP IT NOW!

Callie Wight, MA, RN, C
OOPW
Women's Health Psychosocial Counselor
Women Veterans Coordinator-SACC
GLAHS Military Sexual Trauma Coordinator
Lead Women Veterans Coordinator in VISN 22
VHA-GLAHS-Sepulveda ACC
Sepulveda, Ca. 91343
Office: 818.895.9555
Fax: 818.895.9453

From: Bob
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein, Michael Copps, KM
KJMWEB
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 7:10 PM
Subject: UNE-P deregulation

Deregulation has NEVER worked, not once. We here in CA know more about deregulation than most; monopolies result, every time. Cut the Baby Bells loose and we WILL all pay more. Give it up on UNE-P deregulation...

thanks for your concern,
Bob McCombs

From: johnny davis
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 8:00 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

johnny davis (jd1219@prodigy.net) writes:

mr adelstein

there is no reason to keep harming the worlds best telecommunications companies
by keeping government regulated competition. the rbo's hire people who pay taxes, the other companies do
not.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 65.58.51.148
Remote IP address: 65.58.51.148

From: MARK F. DIXON
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 5:59 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

MARK F. DIXON (m.f.dixon@att.net) writes:

please dont't let the mistakes of the clinton era ruin the bell system. its about time the clecs stood on there own and build there networks or pay a fair price. its not to late to stand up and do the right thing. god bless you . I am praying that god helps you in your vote on thursday.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 12.89.0.215
Remote IP address: 12.89.0.215

From: Mark Dye
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 7:45 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Mark Dye (mdye@telenet.net) writes:

Please continue to regulate Baby Bell's DSL service. Deregulating them will only result in higher prices and worse service.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 209.23.98.10
Remote IP address: 209.23.98.10

From: Morley Farquar
To: Michael Copps
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 4:14 PM
Subject: UNE-P

Dear Commissioner,

It seems to us that elimination of the Unbundled Network Elements Platform (UNE-P) would lead to total loss of competition in local phone service. This clearly must not be in the best interests of the consumer.

Sincerely, Mr. & Mrs. Morley S.

Farquar

From: Gary Hasty
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 10:34 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Gary Hasty (ghasty@hastypudding.com) writes:

RE: UNE-P

It simply is not real competition for the marketplace. Real competition is in the form of facilities based (Cellular, cable, utility companies, etc). By putting the name "ABC Telecom" on a bill and still relying on someone elses resources, you're not really helping the consumer...

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 139.76.65.129
Remote IP address: 139.76.65.129

From: Albert Hou
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 8:48 AM
Subject: ILEC sharing regulations

CS Docket No 02-52 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

Appropriate Regulatory Treatment for Broadband Access
to the Internet over Cable facilities

The question:

Must cable companies allow other ISPs on their cable networks to compete against them, like the Bell Phone companies presently have to do?

Proposed answer:

The LECs operate an "essential facility", and should have to accommodate other ISP firms that wish to purchase access from them. This wholesale provisioning stimulates competition and benefits consumers.

CC Docket No. 02-33 Notice of Propose Rulemaking

Appropriate Framework for Broadband Access to the
Internet over Wire line Facilities

The question:

Must LecS (BOCs) continue to allow other ISPs on their networks to compete against them in the DSL, VOIP, etc., markets?

Proposed answer:

Bell companies operate an "essential facility", and should have to accommodate other ISP firms that wish to purchase access from them. This wholesale provisioning will stimulate competition and be of benefit to the consumers. To not do so would cripple the '96 Telecom Act.

CC Docket No 01-337 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

Review of Regulatory Requirements for Incumbent LEC
Broadband Telecommunications Services

The question:

Should the FCC re-classify incumbent LECs as non-dominant in the Telecom marketplace and allow them to be exempted from rules now in place that allow for competition in the marketplace? Rules such as having to allow other companies (CLECs) into central offices and rules such as the requirement to sell Unbundled Network Elements (UNEs).

Proposed answer:

Do not let the Bell "Wolves" own the chicken coop you already allow them to dominate. Competition requires competitors to be alive. If the FCC lifts the dominant classification from the Local Exchange Carriers (Bells), it will limit competition to a duopoly consisting of a bell and a cable company. Competition in the American Telecom marketplace will not be incentivized, it will be torpedoed. ISPs and CLECs will die, consumers will be deprived of choice and the FCC will be wholly to blame for the travesty. DO NOT DO IT.

CC Docket No 01-338 Review of Section 251 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers Notice of Proposed rulemaking

The question:

Should the FCC re-classify the BELLS as non-dominant in the Telecom marketplace and allow them to be exempted from rules now in place that allow for competition in the marketplace? Rules such as having to allow other companies (CLECs) into central offices and rules such as the requirement to sell Unbundled Network Elements (UNEs).

Proposed answer:

Do not let the Bell "Wolves" own the chicken coop you already allow them to dominate. Competition requires competitors to be alive. If the FCC lifts the dominant classification from the Local Exchange Carriers (Bells), it will limit competition to a duopoly consisting of a bell and a cable company. Competition in the American Telecom marketplace will not be incentivized, it will be torpedoed. ISPs and CLECs will die, consumers will be deprived of choice and the FCC will be wholly to blame for the travesty. DO NOT DO IT.

From: res0wsej@verizon.net
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 8:24 PM
Subject: UNE-P

Dear FCC Commissioner:

Elimination of competitive access to wholesale phone networks will kill local competition and leave consumers with the worst of both worlds, an unregulated monopoly. Please reject the Bell's self serving proposals to eliminate the UNE-Ps, which would pave the way for a bigger, meaner phone monopoly unrestrained by regulatory oversight. Please be sure they are NOT eliminated.

Sincerely,
Michael Ude

From: Roger Palmer
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 7:18 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Roger Palmer (sngslp@yahoo.com) writes:

Please vote to eliminate the rules that require Baby Bell local phone companies to let rivals use their networks at cheap wholesale rates. UNE-P is unfair and a burden not only on the major telephone companies but the U.S. economy. Please encourage the FCC commissioners to act in the countrys interest and limit the states regulatory power. The state regulators are biased against the large telephone companies. They have enacted unfair and burdensome rules which discourage investment and fair competition. We need some deregulation relief.

Any support for future legislation in this regards would be appreciated.

Thank you

Roger Palmer
High Ridge, MO 63049

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 208.190.210.161
Remote IP address: 208.190.210.161

From: John Ryan
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 8:06 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

John Ryan (jer911@hotmail.com) writes:

I am writing to urge you to consider removing the current policy known as UNE-P. I believe the FCC's current policy has given an unfair advantage to companies that are not entitled to be subsidized by the Regional Bells. I think the entire industry is in turmoil and that the FCC has been partially to blame for this mess. As a retiree, my pension has been and continues to be hurt by this unfair UNE-P rule. Please do something to stop forcing the Regional Bells to subsidize the competition. The speculative bubble and corrupt companies like Worldcom, Qwest, and Global Crossing have already done enough damage to the industry without the FCC putting the last nail in the coffin.

Sincerely,

John Ryan

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 66.169.198.32
Remote IP address: 66.169.198.32

From: Roy Rudebusch
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 10:08 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Roy Rudebusch (royrudy@nvcbell.net) writes:

Please rule in favor of doing away with UNE-P. The States don't need to weigh in on this issue. Our economy needs it!! Thanks, Roy Rudebusch, 8797 Silver Shores Dr., Reno NV 89506 775-677-8198

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 63.201.26.18
Remote IP address: 63.201.26.18

From: saabel3@aol.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 10:45 PM
Subject: (no subject)

Dear Chairmen,

I am a telecom employee that was laid off due to the rules and regulations that were set forth by my government. I would hope that when you make your ruling that decides whether I and everyone else affected by you that you would take into consideration that my livelihood depends on your ruling on 2/20/03. Don't get me wrong, I agree with competition, but why would you let companies come in and give them a free ride based on an infrastructure that was built by myself and other employees with the resources provided by my employer, Verizon. It's just not fair, they don't have to go out there and replace the copper or fiber lines, we do!! If you are going to let them do that then they should have to pay for the maintenance.

Please! When you make your ruling all I ask is that you remember the people who aren't represented by lobbyists, influence, and especially money (actually, what's the difference?)! Please remember that even though there are people who have basically bought and paid for this decision and expect it to be in their favor, there are a lot more people who are depending on YOU to make the most fair and the best decision for the working American people and their families, along with the people who expect the kind of service that they think that their money is paying for.

Please make the decision that's right and fair. In this case, when America is losing jobs left and right and you alone have the power to save tens of thousands of jobs I think that you have a responsibility to save American jobs.

Thank you for listening,
Scott Abel

From: MAEdwards@EdwardsIndustries.net
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 5:47 PM
Subject: Keep UNE-P

Message from M.A. Edwards

Edwards Industries/ARC Systems division
2371 Canal Road
Sparks, Nevada 89434

Dear FCC Commissioners:

The Bells are simply attempting to rebuild the monopoly of old. That program didn't work then, and won't work now. The only fair way for competition to take hold and grow is to allow UNE-P to continue until Bell is required to separate the local loop. Once Bell has to live with the same rules imposed on the competition, and the regulatory agencies can determine a fair rate for the use of the loop, there will be no question of 'fairness'.

Threats of job loss and refusal to invest in plant should be rejected out of hand. If the Bells do not wish to invest in their plant, remove the certificate of public convenience and necessity and give it to a company that will honor that principle. Let the Bell then be a REAL competitor and see how they like it. The PSTN was built with funds guaranteed by the ratepayer; it doesn't belong to an RBOC. Somebody needs to remember that. There will always be a PSTN, nobody says it has to be run by an RBOC.

I encourage this Commission to look to the broader view, and what is good for the public and its convenience, not to the monopolistic desires of the few huge and uncontrollable telcos.

Sincerely,

M.A. Edwards

Generated by :
EasyForm - Copyright 1999 by Thomas J. Delorme
<http://getperl.virtualave.net>

From: jack@midpac.net
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 3:39 AM
Subject: (No subject)

DearSir;

One to the certain effects of the proposed rule changes now under consideration by the FCC whereby ILEC unbundled services will be eliminated to CLECs will be the demise of independent ISP nationwide - as the the ILECs will raise the cost of PRI lines to unsustainable levels. We have already seen these actions in Verizon's and SBC's behavior in California and Hawaii with respect to DSL.

Is this what you really want - all the small and medium ISPs and all the associated services and revenue that is created and maintained locally as well as the competitive level of services they bring to the market place GONE!!

If you think this is an exaggeration please look into the California and Hawaii DSL markets. If you allow these companies to control access to the copper lines that they hold a virtual monopoly over you not only will create the conditions whereby existing services like locally provided dsl and dialup will disappear but you will also eliminate the possibilities for new technologies in wireless to be developed.

You are being asked to reinstate one of the most onerous monopolies ever allowed to be imposed in the US - with the resulting 50 years of stagnation and poor service. Think about this and think further that it was not until the Federal government broke up AT&T that the revolution in telecommunications really began to occur. Think carefully what you are being asked to do - this isn't only a question of a fight between many large telecommunications companies - this is about the potential destruction of the environment that allowed 15 years of unfettered technological creativity, entrepreneurial energy and innovation. Look at the fines levied against SBC - fines that this company considers simply as a part of the cost of doing business rather than the result of its flaunting the law. Look at Verizon's decisions NOT to provide broadband to those areas that do not provide ENOUGH ROI. Look even harder at the innovation and energy put forth by the small companies enabled by the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The Baby Bells have clearly embarked on an aggressive plan to re-monopolize as much of the Telco infrastructure as they possibly can - as owning this infrastructure will allow them to monopolize the services now supported by this infrastructure. Access to this infrastructure is vital to the competitive basis of a free society and vital to innovation and vital the sustaining a quality of service level that extends to the most local of levels. I urge you to think prudently and remember your history - remember the years of one phone company and what that was like when all you needed was a phone line.

As an addenda I'd like you to check into the level of service provided to Hawaii by Verizon. This company is reviled in Hawaii. It is a monopoly. The over riding opinion of its services and support is negative. It refuses to provide broadband to many areas. It is a virtual monopoly in Hawaii.

Sincerely
Jack Hendrickson
Lihue, Kauai, HI

Jumping through hoops to get E-mail on the road?
You've got two choices: Join the circus, or use Molly Mail.

Molly Mail -- <http://www.mollymail.com>

Having trouble sending email from different locations ?
Need a single outgoing mail server that will work from anywhere ?

Set it to smtp.com and never have to change it again !

<http://www.smtp.com>
